THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editor: T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 3.] THURSDAY MARCH 6, 1919. [No. 20.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.
Postage As. 13. Extra.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

ASVATTHA II.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

The turmeric marks upon thy trunk remain;
The serpent-gods still linger round thy base;
The women with sweet looks and silk-clad grace
On household welfare bent and inner gain
Adore thee yet. And science asserts in vain
That thou art bark and leaf, mere changing ways
Of earthiness. But e'en the soul that prays
Grim science doth call as mere grey-mantled brain.
The keen-eyed vision of the human heart
Sees deeper, truer, fuller into things,
And there the inner glories shine like stars
Which are unseen 'mid mind's broad daylight's mart
But peep with Poesy's evening's wonderings
And shine in peace when stilled are inner wars,

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 6 MAR., 1919.

Our Editor.

It is with much pain that we have to communicate to our readers the fact that Professor K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., has "on grounds of age and feeble health" resigned his Joint-Editorship of the HINDU MESSAGE. Though he has now dissociated himself from the responsibilities of the Editorship, we can assure our readers that he takes a deep interest in the welfare of this journal, which would never have seen the light of day but for his guiding hand, and will contribute to its pages as often as his health permits. We are deeply indebted to him for his invaluable services on our behalf and will deem it a rare privilege always to be allowed to follow in his footsteps with himself to guide us.

Indian Finance.

In introducing his first Budget and financial statement in the Imperial Legislative Council, Sir James Meston introduced an innovation in the time-honoured practice and made an explanatory speech instead of reading extracts from the Financial Statement. This is a most welcome innovation as it draws particular attention to the salient features of the Budget and leaves the statement itself with its lengthy narrative and many appendices to be studied by the honourable members at leisure. After paying a tribute to his predecessor Sir William Meyer, Sir James proceeds to explain clearly how it happens that what until September last, promised to be a year of bumper surplus under the abnormal conditions created by the war, has since the armistice become a year of deficit almost double the expected surplus. That is to say the current year's revenues will close with a deficit of £ 4½ millions instead of a surplus of £ 2½ millions as provided for in the original Estimates. The change was quite dramatic and they are well portrayed by the Finance Member. The sudden stoppage of the War and the consequent check to private trade, the failure of the South-West Monsoon and the consequent famine and scarcity in the Bombay Presidency, United Provinces, and to a certain extent in the Central Provinces also, and last but not least, the terrible epidemic of Influenza which took such a heavy toll of the rural masses and seriously weakened the agricultural labour power, all these combined together to convert the estimated surplus into an actual deficit. In spite of these conditions we should probably have cloesed the year with a surplus of £ 18 millions but for the resolution of the Imperial Council in September last donating a large amount towards the expenses of the War. This resolution leaves us now a deficit of £ 4½ millions to be made up by borrowing in the coming year.

As regards the coming year, the Finance Member very rightly says that he has prepared "a hard hearted Budget." The only redeeming feature in this budget is the raising of the minimum taxable limit for Income Tax from Rs. 1000 to Rs. 2000, entailing a loss of about half a million £ but affording relief to 237,000 asses-

sees out of a total number of 381,000. This would certainly give relief to hard-pressed persons on low salaries, who have been feeling most severely the pinch of high prices and other abnormal economic conditions now prevailing. Excepting this single welcome concession, we cannot pitch upon any other satisfactory item. On the other hand out of a total estimated expenditure of £ 886,225, 400, nearly one half *i.e.*, about £ 42 millions is allotted to Military expenditure. This is most disappointing, especially when it is found that no liberal provision is made for Education, Sanitation, Industries etc. which have all been practically starved during the past four years. In fact Sir James Meston has not even thought fit to allude to these subjects in his speech. It is a great pity these have become such negligible items. Another disappointing feature to which we desire to draw attention is the allotment of something like £ 24 millions to Railways. No Indian, however, in spite of the special pleading of Sir James Meston, can approve of this doubling of the expenditure on Railways. The biggest Railway programme ever yet undertaken has been £ 12 millions. But now during the coming year it is proposed to spend nearly £ 24 millions on Railways. Even Lord Inchcape would be surprised to read this magnanimously liberal provision in the Budget, for the ideal figure which his Committee pressed upon the Government of India seven years ago is only £ 12½ millions. It is bad policy in an agricultural country like India to pamper Railways to the neglect of Irrigation. We need hardly point out that Irrigation is much more important to Indian agriculturists than railway expansion. Thus when it is stated that the military services and the railways have consumed nearly three fourths of the total expenditure for the coming year and that all other items are allowed only starvation allowances and that our representatives in the Imperial Council are practically helpless in the matter, we can well be justified if we adopt a mood of despair as regards the economic development of the country. On the top of all this another loan is foreshadowed to meet the expenditure of the year. The amount of the loan is tentatively fixed at £ 10 millions. But the Financial member will probably accept as much more as he can get. In the face of this hard-hearted Budget and its excess-profits tax which is strenuously opposed by the mercantile community whose co-operation is necessary in successfully floating this new loan, it is extremely courageous of Sir James Meston to announce this fresh loan and we can only wish his optimism will be justified by the results.

Notes and Comments.

Mrs. De Crespigny points out in an article in *The Nineteenth Century and After* for December that every particle of matter in the universe, from the subtlest to the most dense, is in a state of vibration. It is through these vibrations that the spirit or consciousness of man is adjusting itself and making response to the objects in the universe. The finer, subtler, simpler the vibrations through which the human will makes its response, the more spiritual it is; conversely, the denser and coarser the vibrations through which it makes its response, the less spiritual. She says:—"The physical matter of the flesh is obeying its law in straining after the coarser, slower vibrations leading to inertia, while the spirit reaches towards the higher, more subtle; through the exercise of will we can control the yearning of the coarser, and

convert it into the more spiritual. Inertia urges the flesh into the way of least resistance, the broad and easy path of self-indulgence, of a pandering to the flesh that through opportunity makes it hard for the rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, the path that through an ever-decreasing rate of vibration leads ultimately to destruction.......For those whose keynote has been love—real love, not mere talk about it, who have lived for the service of others, forgetting self—there is a great love waiting, and happiness unspeakable; they will awaken to a consciousness responding through the higher vibrations of the more subtle body to all that is beautiful, all that is spiritual on higher planes, and drawn irresistibly to those whom they have loved there."

*
* *

Of the forms of physical matter, the brain and nervous system of man are the most subtle; and hence human thought,—by securing a proper balance between the energy obtained and the energy expended, by the maintenance of an excess of energy obtained from the higher vibrations of the spiritual realm over the energy expended through the working of the brain and nervous system—can use its mysterious powers "to transmute the energy for evil into an energy for good," to bring the soul into contact with higher and higher influences and to prevent it from straining after lower planes of activity and contact with lower ideals of life. The more human thought and energy obeys the laws and commandments of God, the more is human thought and will enabled to utilise the higher, subtler, vibrations in the loving service of man and the ascent of the soul to the higher reaches of spiritual attainment;—and disobedience, on the other hand results in directing the soul along the path of its own degradation and destruction and into those temptations and impulses of the flesh which correspond to the denser and coarser vibrations of matter which are associated with a life of pandering to the flesh.

*
* *

It is stated that out of 8,700,000 male workers in England before the war, 5,000,000 earned nearly 28 *s.* a week. Out of this amount, 23 shillings were handed over to the wife for household expenses, and 5 shillings were kept by the pater familias for his boots, clothes, club payments, tram charges, beer, tobacco. In South India, most Brahmin and other high-caste families who form the middle class do not earn this amount. If the position of working-class families in England is so bad that "the yearly baby is felt a nuisance, and husbands of the baser sort sometimes wreak physical vengeance on their wives for subjecting them to it, or they temporarily desert the home," what must be the suffering and patience of even heads of middle-class households who have to maintain a fairly high and decent standard of living.

*
* *

It is stated that "one of the objects of (English) working men in marrying is to obtain a supply of cheap domestic labour." Also, "widowers left with children will often explain that they must marry again as they cannot afford to pay a housekeeper who would exact wages as well as adequate maintenance." And yet we are told that in the West men marry out of love, while in India men marry as they want their wives to do house-hold service. Also, "many women never know what their husbands earn, and even if they do, are legally no better off. They have no claim on a single farthing," "The nominally free mother is clearly worse off than the slave, who automatically received a ration from her owner, proportioned to the number of mouths to be fed." Millions of English men and women belonging to the higher set of working-class people lead a social and domestic life like what is depicted above. And, yet, our reformers are in high-falutin regarding the superiority of Western social life and of their high ideals of marriage and womanhood. What we have said above refers to the higher-waged male workers numbering 8 millions. Heaven knows what is the social condition and married life of the classes belew them.

*
* *

We have no doubt that the "upper ten thousand," or even tens of thousands lead a

higher life and possess better social institutions than those belonging to the working-class. The chasm between the higher classes and those below must be a wide one. In India, on ther hand, we have our social institutions in common between the richer and poorer classes, and there is therefore no such chasm as that which divided the two divisions or orders in the West. The great merit of our Indian institutions is that they are adapted to all sorts and grades of society, and we obtain a high social *average* as regards the conditions of home life and the happiness and peace prevailing therein. In the West, there are likely many more individual cases in which a higher maximum of conjugal and household happiness is reached than in India, but here we have the advantage of a higher average for the society as a whole. At the same time, there are not wanting numerous instances in which the highest maximum of domestic bliss and peace is reached. Hence, we are of opinion that all radical changes in our household and social life must be deprecated. We feel convinced that the impatience and impetuosity of our reformers is misplaced, and they would do well to study and compare the standards of life in the West and East more thoroughly than now, before they embark on changes which promise only to bring in unknown evils and cause a shock to the social fabric which has subsisted for thousands of years and worked fairly well on the whole. A Christian Missionary of high reputation once declared that the "social organism (of India) which subsisted three thousand years ago is still living." We do not know whether the same can be said of the social organism of any country in the West which our reformers are so anxious to copy.

* * *

All India admires and adores our greastest leader and statesman, the Hon'ble Pandit Malaviya. He cannot, however, be congratulated on his speech in the Legislative Council in the debate on the Rowlatt Bills. It is a pure waste of time and breath to speak for two hours and a quarter in so forlorn a cause. It argues a solidity which has come on us as a surprise in so great a man as the Pandit, and shows that even our best public men do not fully appreciate their public duty at present. Our public men can gain more for the country by work outside than inside the legislative chamber. We want more of economic development and popular education than now before the masses can sympathise with the political work of our leaders. It is the life of love and service which our leaders devoted to the bettering of the material condition that can alone secure to them their faithful and determined adhesion, and then they will find it easy to overcome the forces of strife which are now in the ascendant. The eminent Pandit has achieved great things for his country, but the masses have still to be impressed and roused to enthusiasm in the cause of political progress. Let us hope that he will devote a portion of his great powers and energies to the undertaking of this great and important work. A living European statesman who has played a notable part in the recent history of one of the small states of Europe has well said:—"The statesman ought to seek power not as an end in itself, but as a means of realising a programme that has sprung from patriotism." It behoves our leaders to place before our people a programme which they can appreciate and support as being useful to them. Our leaders must also do something to advance such a programme by union and effort among themselves. Then the people will adore them and follow where they lead, and then only will the cause of national uplift advance by leaps and bounds. None can resist for ever the longings of the spirit of love to rule the world. The same faith in the rule of love that moves all the disinherited peoples of the world today reigns and moves also in the hearts of the Indian poople and will work for us irresistibly in the future even as the laws of physics and chemistry rule in the world of matter. At any cost India must be made united, and then only will the forces of strife and discord now in the ascendant become transmuted into energies for good. No mere long-drawn speeches in the Legislative Council or even on the public platform can bring about the union

of our people or their support for the cause of freedom which our leaders have set before them as their goal.

Olla Podrida.

We are now living in famous times. A case is going on in the far West about the intricacies of pollution. It is *sub-judice.* Let us not talk about it. But why should the Thiya accused be asked to sit down while the Brahmin accused is ordered to stand? The jubilant counsel for the defence piously raised his eyes to the skies because he was glad that a Brahmin was publicly treated worse than a Thiya.

* * *

This is not the only fun. Mrs. A. B. has written about the resurrection of Indian women. May we know when Indian women committed *johur*? We never knew that Indian woman-hood was dead. But perhaps the time is come for the living to die, because the dead have come to life. Dead ideals are now trying to drive out the living ones. The ideals of far-off lands are trying to replace our own —Men and women come from distant lands, drive away our own old teachers and guides.

* * *

A great battle is waging in Madras. The world-war being over the word-war has begun. It is very edifying. Our young men have excellent ideals of peace and sweet reasonableness to follow in these happy times.

* * *

At Madanapalle the Gokhale day was celebrated. Puja was performed to his portrait. We are not told when the canonisation took place. Perhaps the old gods having been unseated by the modern mind new gods are stepping in. Puja indeed!

* * *

This is the new manliness. Its most perfect manifestation took place a few days ago when a Panjabi Mahomedan, wild at not getting a seat in a third class carriage in a railway train—(he was evidently an idealist),—stabbed his fellow passengers. 12 of these could do nothing. Women and children jumped out of the train and two men were stabbed to death. Such is the new manliness. We lost our arms before. But we have now lost our minds and hearts and souls as well.

* * *

But a new saviour is come. He will achieve everything for us, for the *week shall make it strong.* He has offered Rs. 25 for the best idea and Rs. 25 for the best design to make tho week strong.

SCRUTATOR.

Sanskrit and Modern culture.

BY K. BALASUBRAMANIA AIYAR, B.A., B.L.

(*Concluded.*)

Let us not therefore be deterred by futile objections. Let us conserve our priceless heritage and make the essentials of ancient Hindu culture living and potent forces, at the present day. But all those who love to combine ancient with modern culture must guard against the dangers which are threatening to undermine the proper study of Sanskrit and lead the student along wrong lines. For, we notice some undesirable features which are characteristic of the way in which modern thought has striven to interpret Sanskrit literature and philosophy to the modern student. These tendencies have sometimes largely aided conclusions which have been established from a study of Sanskrit works by those who are interested in gaining currency for the particular school of thought to which they belong. For instance, the Orientalists have in their researches exhibited an unconscious or conscious leaning towards lessening the antiquity of ancient Hindu Works, be they books, inscriptions or monuments. It may be that of late they have tried to shake off the prejudice but there are undoubted evidences of it in their writings. The student will I think on the whole be better advised to accept the traditional dates of Sanskrit works except in cases where he can lay hold of certain data which enable him to fix the date or age of particular works or authors. Even a scholar like Rao Bahadur C. V. Vaidya, who has not shown generally much respect for tradition, comes to the conclusion that the traditional date for 'the Great War' is the more probable one.

Another tendency which is markedly noticeable in the writings of European scholars is the attempt to ascribe foreign origin to Indian Arts or sciences of indigenous growth. Some of them have tried to establish the Greek origin of the Sanskrit Drama and they have been too ready to conclude this from the word जवनिका (meaning a curtain) a variant of यवनिका which is a derivative of the noun यवन. They take the word यवन to denote the Greeks because they imagine it is a corruption of the word "Ionian." At the outset it is very doubtful whether the word जवनिका is a variant of यवनिका. Secondly the Greeks were never known in Europe or Asia as Ionians. It may be that the later Greek invaders were also, like other earlier foreign invaders, called Yavanas in inscriptions, but it cannot on that account be said that the word यवन denotes the Greeks. At any rate it is too much to draw the inference from the word जवनिका that the Sanskrit Drama is of foreign origin and the Hindu learnt it from the Greeks. Similarly some have drawn the inference from यवनानी (यवनाल्लिप्याम्) that writing was known to the Hindus only from the Greeks. Many more instances may be quoted which would show how from slender data important general conclusions have been drawn.

A new method of criticism is now largely in vogue which has been responsible for great confusion,—the theory of interpolation. This method is justly called by the writer in the "Hindu Message" the German method of criticism. It is based on the assumption for which no warrant has been proved to exist in fact, of tampering with the originals by later writers and of dishonest and stealthy insertion rendered possible by the absence of printing and the condition of manuscripts in this country. It has been sometimes used by interested men to strike at all inconvenient texts or passages which may be opposed to their pet notions or theories. Even an impartial and acute critic like Mr. C. V. Vaidya is strongly of opinion that the long metres at the end of every Sarga of the Ramayana are interpolations, by later writers. He has based his conclusion on the repetition of ideas which the long metre stanzas often contain and refuses to believe that Valmiki could ever be guilty of repetition. But you find a poet like Kalidasa re-echoing the sentiments and even the words from the long metres of the Ramayana in his Meghasandesa as in the following verse... दूरीभूते मयि सहचरे चक्रवाकीमिवैकाम्... जाता मन्ये शिशिरमथिता पद्मिनीवान्यरूपा. Compare the Ramayana. हिमहतनलिनी नष्टशोभा व्यसनपरं परयोनिपीड्यमाना। सहचररहितेव चक्रवाकी जनकसुता कृपणां दशां प्रपन्ना ॥

If Kalidasa had read those words in the long metres of the Ramayana and if he had appreciated their poetic merit and been fascinated with them so much as to reproduce them in his own precious poem of Meghasandesa, it may well be contended that the long metres existed in the Ramayana prior to Kalidasa's own time and that Valmiki might with impunity have been guilty of such repetitions. Moreover Dandin the great Alankarika defines a Mahakavya thus सर्वत्र भिन्नवृत्तान्तैः उपेतम् and mentions भिन्नवृत्ति as one of the characteristics of an epic. It may be safely assumed that he would have framed his definition from a perusal of the two great epics, and that he must have read the long metre stanzas in the Ramayana. Instances may be multiplied when even on much more slender evidence people have been too eager to bring in the interpolation theory. Indeed interpolation as a species of criticism has played great havoc on standard classical treatises and produced on the minds of the Indian student and the outside world the unnecessary and false impression of the unreliability of Sanskrit works and tried to destroy their authority. Another defect of modern criticism is the readiness which people have displayed during discussions, especially on social questions, to catch at particular sentences, phrases or anecdotes separating them from the context or the other parts of the work containing them and to use them to support conclusions which they are striving to establish. The fallacy of this method is markedly illustrated in certain arguments used to support Patel's Bill. It has been said that the great sage Vasishtha married the Panchama Akshamala and Manu's authority is invoked. But the people who invoke the authority of Manu ignore the other statement by Manu that Vasishtha married her after giving her a Brahmin body. Surely the Rishis

are too erratic to be made to serve our purposes though people could feign like to do it.

No Social reformer will advocate the practice of Niyoga because Vyasa practised it and became the father of Pandu and Dhritarashtra, or beef-eating because King Jarasandha feasted his guests Arjuna and Krishna with beef, or because the Dharma Sastras have approved of the householder's Dharma श्रोत्रियायाभ्यागताय वत्सतरीं महोक्षं महाजं वा निर्वपन्ति गृहमेधिनः, or Polyandry because Droupadi married the five Pandava heroes and Yudhishthira when questioned by the wondering King Drupada on the occasion of the Svayamvara said "सूक्ष्म्यो धर्मो महाराज नास्य विद्मो वयं गतिम्। पूर्वेषां आनुपूर्व्येण यातं वर्त्मानुयामहे। "We tread the path which has been successively adopted by our forefathers."

Fourthly, the absence of all respect for traditional meanings to texts and passages of undoubted authority has been a fruitful source of confusion in the study of Sanskrit. Theosophists of great renown, intrepid social reformers and European scholars have ascribed new meanings or given their own interpretations to many passages in the books. Of course it cannot be said that Sanskrit words cannot have the meanings which you or I may reasonably give to them or particular passages may not be made to give impression to the ideas ascribed to the authors. The imagination of acute critics may figure new and original ideas ranging from solar myths and the description of natural phenomena to the geological connotation of the Vedas. But the question is whether the authors ever had the intention of expressing those ideas or whether they were at all familiar with them. Tradition knows them not and when we remember that all ancient Sanskrit books commencing from the Vedas have been the products of learned discourses to the assembled students and disciples by renowned Gurus and that the spoken words have been preserved to us in the memory of men with great care and accuracy it is difficult to imagine that the speaker would have intended and the hearer could have understood anything other than what tradition has established to be proper meaning. However fascinating by their originality these ideas may be all seekers after truth have to take them *cum grano salis*.

Lastly the greatest danger has been the hasty and indiscriminate publication of new manuscripts which have not been subjected to a critical examination as to their source, genuineness or authenticity. A new Bhagavad Gita unknown to Sankara or other ancient commentators has appeared in print. It is needless for me to refer to other instances.

Therefore it is incumbent upon us, the inheriters of this rich ancient lore to preserve all useful literature now buried in cadjan leaves, to separate the spurious manuscripts from the genuine ones and to examine, identify, and publish them. In this connection I must protest against the thoughtless handing over of manuscripts to foreign agencies or Universities which are ill-equipped for the task of studying and critically examining them. The whole work must necessarily be in the hands of us and it is an act of unpatriotism on the part of the King of Nepaul to give away a whole library of manuscripts to the Oxford University. On the other hand the student of Sanskrit must also harness to his aid in his difficult task of removing the massy encrustations of blind faith, narrow spirit and dead habit, the new forces of modern thought, the spirit of historical criticism and research, a keen sense of perspective and a liberal mind. Let not the charge be any longer levelled against the sons of modern India that they "have always been wanting in the historical sense, the first instrument for the true intrepretation of the records of the past" and that with them "the achievements of former ages of varied merit differing by virtue of differences in time and local colouring of geographical distribution have obtained an authority destructive of perspective and freedom of thought." Then only will India preserve her individuality and the essentials of her grand civilisation and emerge successful, rejuvenated and strong from the conflict with another great energetic all-consuming but materialistic civilisation. Let our motto be "nothing extenuate nor set down ought in malice nor apologise; speak of things as they were frankly; be proud of achievements." In the words of a great writer India must, in order to live, be faithful to herself. For the Vedic formula rings clear "there is no religion higher than truth." सत्यान्नास्ति परो धर्मः।

Dharma—XVI.

(By K. G. NATESA SASTRI, Vaidya Visarad.)

We saw that the sage Sabaraswami maintains that words relating to matters that cannot be brought within the sphere of our *Indriyas* or *instruments of knowledge*, cannot, if they emanate from human beings, be considered as trustworthy and therefore must be rejected. To understand this clearly let us go back to the great Bhattacharya and see how he construes the saintly words of Sabara. Says he.—

"शब्दे दोषोद्भवस्तावद्वक्त्रधीन इति स्थितिः ।

तदभावः क्वचित्तावद्गुणवद्वक्तृकत्वतः ॥ १ ॥

तद्गुणैरपकृष्टानां शब्दे संक्रान्त्यसंभवात् ।

यद्वा वक्तुरभावेन न स्युर्दोषा निराश्रयाः ॥ २ ॥" इति

The Passage means:—" It is certain that the *rise of faults* in words is due to the fault in the man who utters those words, because faults are not by themselves perceptible in the words; and when they are removed by the presence of *merits* they cannot vitiate the words; and if we know of no human author of those words the faults by themselves vanish as there is no *substratum* for them to rest." On this the Buddhists retort that from this it is plain that since words require merits in their source it follows that the *validity* or *otherwise* of them rests on the merits or faults of their source. To this the Mimamsaka replies that it has already been demonstrated that *merits* in the source can simply make us understand the *absence of faults* only for they cannot obstruct the legitimate *rise of Bodhakatva*. It is well-known that knowledge arises even from words employed to indicate things having no real existence at all: Says Bhatta "अत्यन्तासत्यपि ज्ञानमर्थे शब्दः करोति हि" which means "words generate knowledge even of things having no real existence." To take a well-known example " मृगतृष्णांभसि स्नातः शशशृङ्गधनुर्धरः । एष वन्ध्यासुतो याति खपुष्पधृतशेखरः " ॥ This means "The sun of a barren woman, bathed in mirage, took a bow made of hare's horns and adorned his head with flower from the sky." The things mentioned here are all unreal and yet the words have imparted to us a knowledge of them. Hence it is clear that *merits* or *faults* have nothing to do with the *validity* or *otherwise* of any Pramana viz. *words* in the present case. Therefore it must be admitted that the *words* of the Vedas also have the *ability to impart knowledge* and hence are *valid*. The Buddhists next ask that if the *presence of merits* operates in demonstrating the *absence of faults* it again follows that they are essential to establish the *validity* of *the words* and hence how can you maintain the *validity* to be स्वतः or *of itself at the outset*. The Mimamsaka replies

"तदा न व्याप्रियन्ते हि ज्ञानमानतया गुणाः ।

दोषाभावे तु विज्ञेये सत्तामात्रोपकारिणः ॥" इति,

which means "we have already explained that merits do not operate in generating *Bodha*, but simply exhaust themselves in freeing the source from *faults* which is the desired object." When thus the source is freed the words generate *Bodha* by their inherent power to do so. The Buddhists next say that though this may be true with regard to words of human origin it cannot be maintained that Vedas also are of authority, for the Vedic passages have no origin at all as we do not know anything of their source. This the great Bhatta thus meets:—

"तत्रापवादनिर्मुक्तिर्वक्त्रभावाल्लघीयसी ।

वेदे तेनाप्रमाणत्वं ना शंकामपि गच्छति ॥" इति

This means. "That we do not know anything about the author of the Vedas makes it easier to conclude that there are no faults in them and hence not an iota of doubt arises in our mind as regards its *absolute validity* as a *Pramana* or *right instrument of knowledge*." Incidentally we may mention here that the vigorous Bhattacharya ridicules even the views of the orthodox logicians, the *Naiyayikas* of the ancient days who maintain that since the absence of an author may vitiate the *validity* of the Vedas it must be admitted that the Vedas are the work of an author on whom we can have the highest confidence because that author is nothing but the *Supreme Being* or *Iswara*. Bhatta says that it is useless and a waste of time to seek the author of the Vedas, for the *validity* of any *pramana* including even the words *rests* not upon the authorship but upon its intrinsic *ability to impart knowledge*. Only when the *apramanya* of the Vedas becomes your object which is to be established like the Buddhists you will have to run after an author whose absence will make the Vedas

invalid. But no; your object is to establish the *pramanya* of the Vedas; and this can be easily maintained by the Bodhakatva which is inherent in them. Then why this race after an author? Hence it follows that the absence of an author cannot vitiate its *validity* or *pramanya*.

Next the Buddhists ask that if even human words are *valid* by themselves then why is it that the merits of the source are sought after? To this Bhatta replies thus:—

"पौरुषेये तु वचने प्रमाणान्तरमूलता ।
तदभावे हि तद्दुष्येदितरन्न कदाचन" ॥ इति ॥

which means "True it is that we have to examine the *validity* of the words of human origin with the help of other infallible pramanas; but this is done not with a suspicion that the words are not *valid* by themselves, but only to strengthen their *pramanya* for human beings are generally liable to err and hence we should be certain that no such thing exists in those words; for though *Bodhakatva* may arise this may afterwards be contradicted by another pramana which is equally valid. Hence it is only to strengthen the *validity* of the words that we seek the help of another pramana. But this is not the case with Vedic words." Hence Bhatta sums up thus:

"तेनेतरैः प्रमाणैर्या चोदनानामसंगतिः ।
तयैव स्यात् प्रमाणत्वमनुवादत्वमन्यथा ॥ ९ ॥ इति

We shall deal with this next time:—

Answers to Questions by the University Commission (Calcutta.)

(BY A MADRAS PROFESSOR).

(*Concluded*.)

[NOTE.—The answers to the questions are not given in the order in which the questions are issued. The continuity of my answers depends, therefore, on the order that I have adopted in setting forth the answers.]

QUESTION XVII

The answer to this question has been indicated in my view of the functions of a University set forth already under other questions. I am emphatically of opinion that, at present, "*traditional morality and family ties*" have almost disappeared and in their place we have got nothing worthy of consideration. *Character and physical health* of boys have considerably gone down. The students, I should say, are not at all responsible for this state of affairs.

Boys must be kept away from all influences of *civic* life. The cities, and the political and commercial centres of life are *not* the proper places for educational Institutions. If education should have true *cultural* value, educational Institutions should be completely *segregated* from civic influences and civic contact. In the higher grades of education, especially in the stages when boys are trained for *practical citizenship* and *practical life*, they *must come* in contact with civic life and its practical problems. Till that stage is reached, boys and teachers should live in an *atmosphere of idealism*, so that the work of education may really consist in *souls* responding to and being in communion with *souls*, in the University Colleges. This atmosphere of idealism will make boys physically, intellectually, morally and spiritually *healthy*, in the real sense of the term, and make them really *hale* and *whole*. The present system exerts undue strain on the physical and mental capacities of students, because they are brought up in the suffocating atmosphere of competition and utilitarianism. From birth to death, boys are weak physically and mentally, and it is no wonder that several of the best men throw off the mortal *coil* very early in their lives, weary of their *toil* in this humdrum world.

If, in the best years of their lives, they are brought up in a purely spiritual and idealistic atmosphere, they are bound to live long and really serve their country with *pure* hearts and with *real* love for "god, crown and country." At present in India, it is very imperative that we should have our educational institutions far far away from the nauseating political atmosphere, in which our boys breathe the foul air of self-seeking "patriotism" and tall talk of "morality" and "spirituality" with absolutely nothing but wind in it, when pricked. The brains of our boys now, at least in my opinion, are floating in a veritable "Purgatory," instead of soaring high in a region of calm and serenity as the brains of our ancient boys evidently did in their holy *Gurukulas*, in shady groves in Nature, on the banks of cool and clear streams in *Aryavarta*.

QUESTION XVIII

Answered under XVII.

QUESTION XIX

I have really dealt with all these points in my answers to previous questions. I have only to consider if my scheme is financially *practicable*. My own view is that with the money that is now *actually* spent on *all* matters connected with education, we *must be* able to start such *real* Universities and work them at several centres in India. I do not think that much more money will be required for the purpose, than the money that is now spent for education. We want only the *will* and the *co operation* between the *West* and the *East* in this important matter. If the *will* is there, the *twain shall meet* and for the glory of both.

QUESTION XXIII

My views on the educational needs of women and their functions in life do not permit me to use the foregoing questions to any extent in dealing with this problem.

I am for *very liberal education for women*, and our ancients—Hindus gave very high and liberal culture to our women.

By our modern notions of education for women, we are trying to lessen the value of their lives and to turn them into mechanical factors in society, instead of making them the very repositories of all that is lovely and chivalric in our culture. My views, however, may be set forth in a few general points here, the rest being left to any opportunity that I *may* have (or *may not* have) to work out my views into a *scheme*.

1. Education for women should be in Sanskrit and in their different Vernaculars for the Hindu women, and in their own mother-tongues for the women of other communities.
2. The *agency* for educating women cannot come from outside their *homes*. School education, college education, and co-education are *not* for Indian women, at least for *Hindu* women, and I believe, *Mahommedan* women also. Any scheme set forth for the higher education of women will help only Anglo-Indian and Indian Christian women, and those Hindu and Mahommedan women, whose guardians break away from their traditions or misinterpret their traditions, in the name of reform and progress on so-called modern lines etc.
3. We *want* a large mass of vernacular literature *produced* for *their* use, and we must have large circulating libraries in Vernaculars, for the use of women in all subjects, at various centres. We must work out the idea of the English *Home University Library* with a vengeance in this country, if we should really educate our women in India, on modern lines. The sphere of Indian women must be, in my opinion, *the home*, if we should save them from the unhappiness of several of the modern problems affecting women.
4. As far as *Hindu* women are concerned, I am strongly of opinion that as our shastra says:

स्त्रीमूलः सर्वधर्मः

"*All Dharma has its root in the woman.*"

The War and After.

[BY S. V. VIJAYA RAGHAVACHARI.]

We have just finished the bitter War. We entered into it in a righteous cause. We have hunted the wicked knaves, and taught them a lesson. We have made the Kaiser eat the humble pie and atone his wicked deeds by doing severe penance for the rest of his earthly existence. We have saved civilisation from a destructive tide, and upheld world's justice and liberty. We may well be proud of our achievements.

But what next? We are now over the Peace Conference and the League of Nations. And from what we hear of them, I think we may well speculate. If all that is prophesied of the League should come true, I think we may at once order the "ascension robe" and give a near date for the Millennium to come, and commence our joyous decorations for its proper reception. But I fear the prophesied Millennium is not likely to spring out of these hothouses. We are yet living in an age when the Ten Commandments have no more interest for us than as affording an after-dinner amusement between intervals of champagne, the author of them to be appreciated as a fine fellow who said fine

things, and the fine things themselves admired, like Rumboldt's pictures, whenever convenient and our digestive organs are in proper order. I confess to a belief that it is not unlikely that the combined civilisation of the world may yet show fine sets of white teeth to the accompaniment of acoustic exhibitions not dissimilar to those of—well, I won't say what. Mr. Wilson's incisors may yet feel the calf muscles of Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Lloyd George's molars those of M. Clemenceau's nape, Lord Sinha sniffing all the while from outside the enclosure, and the whole of India yapping at the moon in boisterous chorus. But it is something that it is never going to be so bad as the meeting at Pecksniff's over Chuzzlewit's fortunes. We are also living in an age when we have learnt to patch holes, to counterfeit, shake hands cordially with each other and laugh in combination. We will therefore certainly reach a conclusion—may be, in a way, but something really to be thankful about. But Oh! the world-peace and the anticipated Millennium—that appears to be yet far, far away. We may perhaps expect it, as the poet says, only

"When lawyers take what they would give
And doctors give what they would take."

or

"When legislators keep the law
When banks dispense with bolts and locks"

and when the Ten Commandments begin to possess for us more practical interest than to be belched out for an after dinner pastime.

I have perhaps been too cynical and talked too irreverently and flippantly for delicate sensibilities, but I sincerely beg pardon which, I think, is a sufficient reparation for many sins including that of one kissing his neighbour's wife.

Gleanings.

Democracy versus bureaucracy.

(By SHYAM BEHARI LAL.)

Of the varied aspects of the human society of to-day, one is the awakening in the masses all the world over of the consciousness of their political existence. The sentiment of national pride is keener and more widely diffused nowadays than it was in former times. The questions which directly affect the sons of soil and toil are those most calculated to enlist their sympathy, and the governing classes conscious of this fact have begun to modify their tactics accordingly. The masses have realised the condition of poverty, ignorance and misery in which a large part of them spend most part of their lives—a condition brought into existence by a certain number of economical forces, themselves the result of great progress in material sciences during the past one and a half centuries. This consciousness has led to what is known as the co-operative movement and the formation of trade-unions all over Europe and Europeanised world. The latter have come to the conclusion that the amelioration of the condition of the vast masses of the labourers is impossible unless they have a hand in politics and send their representatives to their respective legislative assemblies. They advocate the doctrines of socialism. The middle classes see and realise that their interests clash and are in conflict with those of the wealthy classes and the feeling is based upon a bitter experience in the past that as long as the government remains in the hands of the latter, their interests would be crushed. This has raised the problem whether the government is to be carried on in the name of a people merely, by a privileged class for its own benefit, a government irresponsible to the people at large or it is to be carried on by the people for the good of the nation as a whole and responsible to the nation as a whole. In other words, whether there is to be a democracy or a bureaucracy. Before I describe the forces that are gravitating towards the success of democracy over all other forms of government to the utter mortification of the bureaucrat, I may let you know what I understand by the two terms.

Bureaucracy may be defined as a system of government centralised in graded series of officials responsible only to their chiefs and controlling every detail of public life as it was till lately in Germany. On the other hand a democracy may be defined as a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people collectively and is administered by them or by officers appointed by them, *e. g.*, in France.

Before I examine these two definitions, I shall make clear certain terms which I shall use, by giving their explanations.

Reduced to its fundamental principles the problem of government is how to protect

members of a State against outside attacks and internal dissensions and how to promote their general welfare. Thus external and internal protection and the promotion of the general welfare comprise all the responsibilities of a government. If it avoids any of these two or adopts a course which is prejudicial to any of these two, it does what it ought not to do and in doing so it violates the rights of the members of the State, who naturally resent it and come in conflict with the government. In order to carry out its proper work, the government has to frame laws and make the machinery to carry them out, *i. e.*, it has got power to legislate and to execute the legislation. Thus the task of the government is divided between the legislative and the executive. Now I proceed to examine the definitions which I gave of bureaucracy and democracy.

The former definition may be analysed into three clauses :—

(*a*) Centralisation of authority in graded series of officials,

(*b*) their responsibility to the head of government alone,

and (*c*) control of every detail of public life.

Taken as a whole the three elements in a bureaucracy exhibit its great power of organisation which is essential to success in all departments and enjoin strict discipline and obedience on its members.

But the power being vested in a graded series of officers—the lower officer is responsible to his immediate superior officer and the latter to his immediate superior officer—each officer from the lowest to the highest forms but a link in the chain, the last remaining unlinked which represents the absolute authority of the highest officer who is the head of the government. Now the highest authority might be vested in a single individual or a few members of them who are absolute, *i. e.*, are not responsible to the people whom they govern.

The danger of such a system lies in the fact that it may deviate and such systems have deviated from the right path *i. e.*, they have avoided what they ought to have done and done what they ought not to have done. They have actually put restrictions upon anybody and everybody's right to move about from one place to another or from one country to another. They have stinted and stifled a nation's education, repressed the freedom of its press, disarmed its citizens, if citizens they might be called who have no rights of citizenship, and neglected and crushed its industries. They have embittered the public life of the governed and have even in some cases interfered with the sacrosanctity of their private life. The wretchedness and and the miseries of the people have only increased in cases where the personnel of the bureaucracy happens to be of foreign extraction, *i. e.*, where this form of government is superimposed upon a people by individuals of an alien race. But my quarrel is not with the personnel but with the system itself.

Now have you ever tried to understand the psychology of the bureaucrat? It is this. The bureaucratic form of government is good for a country, I would not call nation, in the period of its lactation. Its work is educational. It moulds the different tribes into a national unit. Beyond that it has no justification to continue to exist. It has to give over charge to democracy. But the difficulty lies in the fact that instead of quietly and peacefully transferring its authority to its successor it tries to continue by unlawful means its unlawful lease of life and in consequence it has to be dethroned. The bureaucrat is a parasite. He enjoys freedom by withholding the same from its legitimate proprietors, *i. e.*, the people at large. He has resorted unscrupulously to the tyrant's most terrible instrument of refusing the right of open trial and committing innocent individuals to jail on the pretext of public safety. Even the devil has his good side, it is said, and in the same manner even the bureaucracy can justify its unlawful actions by the appointment of what are called "commissions." Further to strengthen its position it sets up a strong militarism at the cost of the people ready to be used even against the very people themselves if they ever try to open their muzzled mouths and utter the word 'liberty.' The evils of such a system have been amply demonstrated in the case of the German East African Colonies where the people used to live daily under a sundry sort of such other tortures. This leads to movements at first secret and then open like those of the Communists. It is the result of this system that Bolshevism is at present rampant in Eastern and Central Europe.

So much for Bureaucracy. Now I must examine the definition of Democracy. It may be analysed into two clauses :—

(*a*) The supreme power is vested in the people collectively,

and (*b*) administration is carried on either directly by themselves or by the officers appointed by them.

Now there are two things introduced here. First the power is transferred from an individual or a few individuals or even from a privileged class to the people themselves. They are the sovereign. Some might call it a paradox, but like all other paradoxes it has to be understood in order to grasp the deeper significance which underlies it. It does not mean that any individual can exercise the sovereign authority. That would be anarchy against which we are fighting. But the people as a whole possess that sovereign power which is denied to the individual. Moreover the people collectively relegate their authority for immediate purposes of legislation and its execution to a number of themselves while retaining to themselves the ultimate authority. They can criticise the actions of the body to whom authority has been relegated and can even dismiss it if they like. Usually the people choose their legislature which appoints the executive which is responsible to the legislature and through it to the people at large This briefly put is the principle of democracy. *The Modern Review.*

(*To be continued.*)

The Indian Caste.

The following letter appears in *the New Age* of London on the subject of Indian Caste from the pen of Mr. N. Subrahmanya Aiyar M.A., Senior Dewan Peishcar, Travancore. It contains a passing reference to Caste in relation to political progress in India :—

Sir,

In your notes of May 30, you say the following :— "Analogies are usually unsafe, but the analogy between the circulation of the blood in the body and of the currency in the nation is close. Now, suppose that there were in the body an organ for the collection and distribution of blood, whose criterion of distribution should be not the need of the whole, nor even the needs of the parts, but the advantage to itself, would not such an organ be diseased, a sort of cancerous heart? In permitting a Money Trust to be formed in the nation, intent solely on its own private profit, and both collecting and distributing currency with only that object in view, what are we doing, however, but establishing just such a cancerous heart in the body politic? The inexpert sociologists will not know what is wrong with the State when such a hidden organ has been formed. Their diagnosis will stop at symptoms, and their prescriptions at patent medicines."

The ideas you have expressed form the kernel of the principle of Indian caste and the secret of its abuse, The various castes and sub-castes in India are so many organs of the body politic. It must be also noted that India is made up of a number of territorial divisions—not one nation but a nation of nations —each being constituted on the principle of a common language. There are thus two principles of caste formation in India—the territorial and the functional, Each territorial population constitutes a self-contained nation, as it were, with its various functional castes, and presents distinctions and observes exclusiveness for purposes of marriage and other kindred things, not only as between its own functional castes, but also as between a particular functional caste of a linguistic territory and the same functional caste of another linguistic territory. This is caste and its distinctions. But now it is all a case of disease and disorder. The idea that an organ exists, "for the need of the whole" and "not for advantage to itself" has been forgotten, and the "inexpert" Indian sociologist labours under want of knowledge as to *what* is wrong. His diagnosis stops at symptoms, and his prescriptions at patent medicines. The mistake is not the fact that the national organism is made up of distinct organs, but in the fact that these distinctions have lost their *raison d'etre* in distinction of function. Not recognising this fact, and not knowing how to harness these distinctions for the happiness of all, her so-called "social reformer" lays his axe at the distinctions themselves. He does no constructive work, nor cares to understand in a spirit of sympathy and fairness the purpose and meaning of those distinctions. He does not therefore think of re-infusing what is lacking, *viz.*, the function. In the light of this policy, sex distinctions may also be deplored when marriage has succeeded in ceasing to be the normal institution for man or woman. Since the Indians themselves do not care to understand or do not succeed in understanding their own position, and look upon the existence of these distinctions as a bar to social unity and political progress, it is no surprise that high-minded English gentlemen like the Secretary of State for India. for instance, should include the presence of caste distinctions in the category of circumstances that make caution necessary.

The Inter-Caste Marriage Bill.

Mr. M. K. Gandhi has expressed the following opinion on this Bill :—

"In my opinion, the question, specially as between Brahmanas and Dheds does not arise in this connection at all. Dheds stand in the same relation to Brahmanas as Kshatriyas, Vaishyas or Shoodras. Their peculiar disability is not affected either one way or the other by the Bill. If the Bill constitutes an attack upon *Varnashram*, as a believer in *Varnashram-dharma* I should oppose it. I am told by my orthodox friends that it does constitute such

an attack. I am told by the supporters of the Bill that not only does it not interfere with *Varnashram*, but it merely seeks to restore the pre-British state of Hindu Law, which was wrongly interpreted by judges who, being ignorant of it, were guided by biassed or corrupt Pandits. Both sides have very able lawyers. Without deciding one way or the other I have suggested that the effect of the Bill should be restricted to intermarriages among sub-castes. This might satisfy the most ardent reformer at least as a first step, and would enable men like the Hon. Pandit Malaviya to support it."

* * *

Proceedings of a Meeting of the General Body of Members of the above Sabha held on Sunday, the 9th February in the premises of the above Sabha to consider the Bill No. 17 of 1918, introduced in the Indian Imperial Legislative Council by Mr. Patel for the validation of certain Hindu Marriages.

The following Resolutions were unanimously passed:—

Resolved that the Madura Dharma Sastra Sabha is strongly and unanimously of opinion

(1) that the Bill introduced by the Hon'ble Mr. Patel in the Imperial Legislative Council to validate the marriages between the Hindus of different castes is opposed to the *Shastras* and their observances and custom from time immemorial;

(2) that the Bill is very defective and uncalled for;

(3) that the Bill, if passed into law, will lead to the disruption of Hindu Society and disturb the harmony and peace of Hindu Homes, besides leading to disastrous results in respect of material, moral and spiritual advancement of several communities, each in its own customary and ordained ways;

(4) that the Bill will destroy the special features of the Hindu culture and civilization, which has been preserved through countless ages;

(5) and that the Bill is a serious violation of the solemn pledges of neutrality in religious matters, granted by the Royal Proclamation of 1858 of Queen Victoria, Empress of India, and which has been equally guaranteed by the pledges and proclamations of subsequent Emperors of India.

Correspondence.

Dakshina Bharata Dharma Mandal.

A Public meeting of the Sanatana Dharma Hindus in Southern India was held at Kodiyalam on the invitation of the Hon'ble Mr. K. V. Rangaswamy Iyengar on the 22nd and 23rd February 1919 under the Presidentship of Gurubhakta Sikhamani, Shastra Prasara Bhushana T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyer of Srirangam. There was a large attendance, the Pandits alone numbered more than 200, Among those present were:—1. Mahamahopadhyaya Hathibhai Shastri Harishankar of Jamnagar 2. Vyakaranacharya, Vidyanidhi Giridharalal Shastri of Jaipur 3. Dr. Paranjpaye L.M.S., of Poona 4. Chatuh Shastra Kalpaturu Sesha Chariar of Kumbakonam 5. Brahmasri Panchapakasa Shastri, the Asthana Pandit of the Kumbakonam Mutt 6. Vidyanidhi R. Krishnama Chariar of Madura 7. Soora Lakshmiah Chettiar of Srirangam 8. Mr. C. Rajalinga Chettiar Zamindar of Elamballi 9. S. S. Vyasa Rao of Srirangam, 10. Kavisekhara, Narayana Shastri of Trivadi, 11. Sahityaratna T. Srinivasachariar of Trichinopoly and others.

The proceedings began with the recital of Mangala Slokams by Brahmasri Sesha Chariar and Narayana Sastrigal.

The Srimukham from His Holiness Sri Jagad Guru Sri Sankaracharlar of Kumbhakonam, one of the Samrakshakas (patrons) of the Bharata Dharma Maha Mandal, wishing all success and prosperity to the Mandal was read. Prasadams were then distributed.

The Chairman in opening the proceedings gave a detailed account of the work of the Maha Mandal and of the necessity for the establishment of a Provincial Mandal in Southern India with Headquarters in Trichinopoly. Mr. T. V. Swaminatha Aiyar, its Secretary, then gave a brief account of his three years' work revealing, as it did a steady progress which was appreciated by all. He further said that there are now in Southern India two Ruling Princes and three Dharmachariars as Samrakshakas (Patrons), 6 Prati Nidhis (Trustees), a dozen advisory members, 60 supporting members and more than 200 ordinary members of the Bharata Dharma Mahamandal of Benares.

Letters and telegrams sympathising with the movement and wishing success and prosperity were then read from the following gentlemen:—

Vedanta Bhushana A. Govindachariar of Mysore; Rai Bahadur Appoo Shastrigal of Kumbakonam: Mr. R. Ganapathi Ayyar Secretary, Dharma Shastra Sabha, Madura; Professor N. K. Venkatesa Ayyar M.A., of Anantapur and Brahmasri Ramaswami Shastrigal of Mannargudi.

Then the following resolutions were passed:—

1. That this meeting of Sanatana Dharma Hindus of Southern India resolves to form

the Dakshina Bharata Dharma Mandal as the Provincial organisation of the Mahamandal of Benares.

2. that a Council consisting of representatives from different districts of nearly 50 members as per list read out be elected with power to add to their number and to make rules and bye-laws.

3, that the following gentlemen be elected as office-bearers of the Managing Committee :—

The Hon'ble Dharma Bhushana K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar, President; Professor Dharma Bhushana K. Sundararama Ayyar of Kumbakonam, T. R. Ramachandra Aiyar of Madras, N. Subramania Ayyar M.A., (Senior Dewan Peshkar) of Trivandrum and Gurubhaktasikhamani, Shastra Prasara Bhushana T. K. Balasubramania Aiyar of Srirangam, Vice Presidents; Dharma Vinode T. V. Swaminatha Ayyar, General Secretary; Rao Saheb L. A. Rangaswami Iyer, Joint Secretary; and Vidyanidhi K. Krishnamachariar Pandit-Secretary.

4. Proposed by Mahamahopadhyaya Hathibhai Shastri of Jamnagar, seconded by Chatubshastrakalpataru Sesha Chariar of Kumbakonam, Brahmasri P. Panchapakesa Sastrigal, Asthana Pandit of Sri Sankara Mutt, Kumbhakonam, Brahmasri Puthamkotta Srinivasachariar of Mannargudi, Vidyanidhi, R. Krishnamachariar of Madura, Brahmasri Tirumalaitatachariar of Tiruvadi, Giridharlal Sarma of Jaipur, Dr. Paranjpaye of Poona and S. S. Vyasa Bao of Srirangam, and several other Pandits from all parts of India and carried unanimously :—

4. That this meeting holds on the authority of the Hindu Darmasastras that the Intercaste Marriages validating Bill introduced by Mr. Patel in the Imperial Legislative Council is opposed to the Hindu sentiments, customs, traditions and religion, and is against the most ancient, most sacred and fundamental institution of the Varnasramadharma and requests His Excellency the Viceroy to be kind enough to drop this Bill and thereby maintain the just and noble policy of the benign British Government of not interfering with the religious matters of any community.

5. That the Chairman be authorised to communicate the Resolution No. 4 to His Excellency the Viceroy in Council.

6. Proposed by the Hon'ble Mr. K. V. Rangaswami Iyengar, seconded by Mr. Sura Lakshmiah Chettiar, supported by Mr. K. Seshadri Aiyar, Inamdar, Ramnad and carried unanimously.—

That the next Mahadhivesan of Sri Bharata Dharma Mahamandal be invited to meet at Kodiyalam during the next festival season, *i.e.*, February 1920.

After proposing the usual vote of thanks, the meeting came to a close.

Wit and Wisdom.

[BY W. DORAISWAMY AIYAR.]

India has "the Highest" in the world—the noble and immovable Himalayas—reaching to the heavenly Kailas, the blessed abode of Gaurisankar, with its happy peak of Everest, there is *ever rest* in that cloud-wreathed, snow crowned, hermit-wooing summit! But never mind the largest, longest, or deepest thing which may be elsewhere. They are only terrestrial and unsteady. Why even among the oceans one is called after India and again this linga-shaped triangular India is the largest country in the largest continent of the globe; and again China the most populous country in this planet is indebted to India for her religion and God. Our holy and universalising India stands for *I Note Divinity In All*! Quite curiously our 33 crores of gods are all to be found in the shape of men in India together with Tibet up, Burma East and Ceylon down.

* * *

Better to be lean of body than mean of mind. Better to have a clean clear heart than a keen clever head for intellectuality is just above bestiality but morality approximates to divinity.

* * *

Conscience is so called because it *cons* the good and *shuns* the bad. So also a *sincere* man is a *sin seer*.

* * *

A fickle minded man cannot be philosophical nor a litigous one religious.

* * *

Seek well your Guru and the *sequel* will be happy; but theoretical arguing is like theatrical acting. A man not firm is no better than a worm but a straight man is often in straits.

* * *

Wait and *weigh* things in a calm *way* and then your opinions will have due *weight*.

* * *

In the *right* path there is no fright but the wrong one must be *left*. You think *Right* to be trite until you feel the prong of *Wrong*.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B. A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.